



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/101,945 07/17/98 SAITO

K

Sh

EXAMINER

QM12/0405

FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS
2026 RAMBLING ROAD
KALAMAZOO MI 49008-1699

MANUEL, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

10

DATE MAILED:

04/05/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/101,945

Applicant(s)
Saito et al

Examiner
George Manuel

Group Art Unit
3737



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 11, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-27 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-27 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 6

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3737

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-7 and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin et al '735 in view of Grendol '534.

Martin et al teach varying the shape of the gate by considering the wall thickness of a lens which is to be molded (see col. 7, lines 1-15). Further, there is teaching to produce different shaped lenses by changing the shape of different inserts (see col. 11, lines 30-33).

Grendol '534 teaches a molding process using thermoplastic resin to form minus lenses, in addition to exchanging inserts for producing different shaped lenses (see col. 4, lines 33-35).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to combine the teachings of Grendol with the teachings of Martin et al to make minus lenses because a minus lens is merely a particular type of molded lens which is capable of being made with the teachings of Martin et al.


Further, Grendol teaches a compatible similar "compensating" procedure for controlling the flow of resin into the mold for lens formation. This "compensating" appears to be accomplished by considering the upper die 59 to move in a "gating" fashion.

Art Unit: 3737

The examiner is relying on the teaching of Grendol, col. 6, lines 60-65, that the coating and cleaning of the blank is well known in the prior art

Conclusion

2. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bakalar '854 discloses gates **20** and teaches each gate may be adjusted when lenses of considerably different thickness are molded.
3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Manuel whose telephone number is (703) 308-2118.


George Manuel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3737
April 1, 2000